REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the Examiner Interview conducted on November 17, 2005.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, and 12 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, and 12.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended as discussed during the Examiner Interview of November 17, 2005. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 12 are amended to incorporate the limitations that processing the Java server page using the plurality of tags comprises (i) processing a command tag in the plurality of tags to create a collection and (ii) processing a collection tag in the plurality of tags to reference the collection. Further, independent claims 1 and 12 are amended to include the limitation that the collection includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a collection of scheduled events, a collection of scheduled reminder messages, and a collection of lines of text of individual appointment descriptions. Also, as discussed during the Examiner interview, independent claims 1 and 12 are amended to clarify that transmitting the Java server page is performed after creating the collection and processing the Java server page.

Further, independent Claim 7 is amended to include the limitation that the collection includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a collection of scheduled events, a collection of scheduled reminder messages, and a collection of lines of text of individual appointment descriptions. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 20, lines 21-31 to page 21, lines 1-9 of the instant specification. Further, dependent claims 2, 4-6, 13, and 15-17 have been amended to correspond to the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 12.

No new subject matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6 and 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0159136 ("Rouse"). As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended by way of this reply. To the extent that the rejection still applies to amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to providing calendar functions to a client using a Java server page and tags embedded in the Java server page. Specifically, in order to process the Java server page, the tags must also be processed. Further, the tags as recited in the amended claims are not standard http tags such as "get" and "post." Rather, the tags include, for example, a command tag and a collection tag. A command tag creates a collection, while a collection tag is used to reference the collection. A collection may be a collection of scheduled events, a collection of scheduled reminder messages, or a collection of lines of text of individual appointment descriptions. (*See, e.g.*, Instant Specification p. 20, ll. 26-31). Thus, processing the Java server page requires that the tags contained therein are processed (*i.e.*, a collection is created and referenced). Further, only after creating the collection and processing the Java server page is the processed Java server page transmitted to the client. (*See, e.g.*, Instant Specification p. 21, ll. 7-8).

Turning to the rejection, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach or suggest every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Applicant respectfully asserts that Rouse does not teach or suggest transmitting a Java server page to a client after processing a collection tag and a command tag included in the Java server page, as discussed during the Examiner interview on November 17, 2005.

Specifically, Rouse is directed toward a web application for wireless devices access to electronic mail, calendar, etc. In order to provide the wireless device access, users may customize the user's view through a menu of options and forms with fields *while the application is executing.* (*See, e.g.*, Rouse p. 6, paragraph [0069]). Accordingly, because the menu of options are processed while the application is executing, the menu of options cannot be equated to tags that are processed before the Java server page is transmitted, as asserted by the Examiner (*See* p. 3 of Office Action mailed September 9, 2005).

8

Moreover, in contrast to the invention as recited in the amended claims, Rouse is completely silent with respect to the processing of command tags and collection tags before transmission to client. In fact, the only tags Rouse suggests having are HTML "get" and "post" tags. (*See, e.g.,* Rouse p. 3 paragraph [0043]). As it is known in the art, an HTML "get" tag merely obtains whatever URL is identified with the get request and a "post" tag simply adds any data identified with the "post" request to the backend. Neither the "get" tag, nor the "post" tag are used to create or reference a collection. Accordingly, Rouse cannot be used to teach a command tag to create a collection or a collection tag to reference the collection as required by the amended claims of the present invention.

Further, Rouse fails to teach or suggest having a command tag to create a collection of scheduled events, reminder messages, or lines of text of individual appointment descriptions, or a collection tag to reference one of the aforementioned collections as required by the claimed invention. Specifically, as discussed above, Rouse is completely silent with respect to a command tag to create a collection. Therefore, Rouse cannot be used to teach that the collection created by the command tag corresponds to a collection of scheduled events, reminder messages, or lines of text of individual appointment descriptions.

In view of the above, it is clear Rouse does not support this rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 12. Further, claims 2-6 and 13-17, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 12, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,343 ("Wang"). As discussed above, independent claim 7 has been amended by way of this reply. To the extent that the rejection still applies to amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 7 is directed toward generating an extended Java server page for providing extensible client calendar functions. Specifically, as recited in amended claim 7, a Java server page is invoked by a page editor application to generate a new Java server page. As known in the art, a page editor application is used to modify the code of a Java server page. Specifically,

tags may be added, modified, or deleted from a pre-existing Java server page to create a new Java server page. Further, as specifically recited in the amended claims, the tags specified in the Java server page includes a command tag is specified to build or reference a collection, a collection tag is specified to provide access to the collection, and a bean tag is specified to access individual objects. The collection may be a collection of scheduled events, a collection of scheduled reminder messages, or a collection of lines of text of individual appointment descriptions.

In order to support the rejection of independent claim 7, the Examiner asserts that the page editor application of the claimed invention used to generate a new Java server page is the same as a Capplet as taught by Wang. (*See* p. 5 of Office Action mailed September 9, 2005). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, a Capplet as defined by Wang is an application that executes within a web calendar to provide multimedia effects or event related transactions for scheduled events (*See, e.g.,* Wang col. 4, lines 50-60). More specifically, a Capplet is used to perform mail-alerts, beep alerts and pop-up alerts. (*See, e.g.,* Wang col. 6, lines 63-65). Further, a Capplet is used while a Java applet is executing in order to populate a backend database. When information is returned from the backend database, information is used to populate a pre-existing web page with data. Accordingly, the only newly created object by Wang is the entry in the backend database, not a Java server page. Therefore, Wang does not teach or suggest generating a new Java server page using a page editor application as recited in amended claim 7 of the present invention.

Further, Wang does not teach using a command tag, collection tag, or bean tag to provide access to a collection of scheduled events, scheduled meeting reminders, or lines of text of individual appointment descriptions as recited in the amended claim. In fact, Wang is completely silent with respect to any of the aforementioned collections of objects. Therefore, it would be clear to one skilled in the art that Wang cannot teach or suggest having tags which are able to create, reference, or provide access to a collection of scheduled events, scheduled meeting reminders, or lines of text of individual appointment descriptions.

In view of the above, it is clear Wang does not support the rejection of amended independent claim 7. Claims 8-11, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 7, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number [03226/422001]).

Dated: December 9, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA • LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants

125373_2

11